

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_117500
Title of the Manuscript:	EXPLOITATION OF GRAFTING FOR ABIOTIC AND BIOTIC STRESS MANAGEMENT IN VEGETABLE CROPS: A REVIEW
Type of the Article	Systematic Review

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalair.com/index.php/AIR/editorial-policy>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>The review article is also divided into three other categories, which are different in terms of writing and number of words. Narrative review article (narrative review) This type of article review has comprehensive and practical topics. In a narrative review, a summary of the primary and original studies of a subject is discussed. The result of these articles refers to quality instead of quantity. Systematic review article (systematic criticism) This type of essay examines a question and tries to answer it by providing evidence and analyzing the issue during the essay. The final result is drawn from different researches. Best Evidence Review (Best Evidence) This type of article is actually the middle of two other review articles and it can be considered a combination of these two. In this type of review article, a sufficient review of a research is placed in the reader's choice so that the reader can independently draw conclusions based on it.</p> <p>Based on this, the author tries to present a manuscript with systematic review content. But the results are very general and inconsistent with the goals of an article. It is necessary for the respected author to use references and sources correctly. Some of the references in the list are not used even once in the text! This version was probably unprofessionally taken from a thesis and needs to be addressed more. The question raised at the beginning of the manuscript is not a challenging one. Please follow the format of a review article to rewrite it and resend it.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	Yes	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Arash Vaghef Koodehi
Department, University & Country	Science and Nanotechnology Research Institute of Kashan University, Iran